REMARKS

Claims 3-24 are pending in the present application. In this amendment, claims 3-12 are amended for more clarity and concise and claims 13-24 are newly added. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims and the rejection/objection in view of the following remarks.

Allowable Claim

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of the allowable subject matter in claims 5-9. In view of the remarks below, claims 5-9 remain dependent form.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 3, 4 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evensen, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0153332, hereinafter "Evensen"), previously used, in view of Salmenkaita et al. (U.S. Patent No.7707886, herein after "Salmenkaita") recently discovered. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and thus, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 12, as amended, recites a handling method after updating of privacy profile of a target UE and the method comprises: when a location service (LCS) system is aware that privacy profile of the target UE was updated, for a deferred location request in activated state from a LCS client requesting for location information of the target UE against the UE, the LCS system performing a privacy check based on the update privacy profile of the target UE; if the deferred location request passes the privacy check, the LCS system continuing to handle the location request; if the deferred location request does not pass the privacy check, the LCS system initiating a cancellation procedure to the deferred location request. Applicant respectfully submits that the references of record fail to disclose or teach all limitations of claims 12.

As shown above, claims 12 as amended form specifies the location request against the target UE as a deferred location request in activated state. That is, claim 12 is directed to the handling/processing of a deferred location request in activated stated against a target UE after the update of privacy profile of the target UE. In contrast, as is evidenced throughout the disclosure, Evensen is directed to the provision of enhanced user privacy when responding to a location request from a client. Evensen at best discloses the general location request, but fails to disclose or even mention any deferred location request, at all. Thus, for this point, Evensen fails to disclose or suggest any limitation of amended claim 12.

Salmenkaita fails to make up for the deficiencies of Evensen because, as is evidenced throughout the disclosure, Salmenkaita does not relate to handling of location request or location service at all, nor disclose or mention any location request or the like. Thus, Salmenkaita also fails to disclose or teach any limitation of claim 12. Therefore, at least for this reason, the combination of Evensen and Salmenkaita fail to disclose the deferred location request in activated stated and all related limitations of claim 12.

Furthermore, as shown above, claim 12, as amended, discloses that the LCS system performs the privacy check based on the updated privacy profile of the target UE. That is, in claim 12, the privacy check on the deferred location request against the target UE is performed according to information of the updated privacy profile of the target UE. By contrast, Evensen fails to disclose or mention that his provision of enhanced user profile is implemented/performed based on any updated or changed privacy profile, as Evensen does not mention anything about the change or update of the user profile or the like (discussed in Applicant's response on February 10, 2010 to the final office action and accepted by Examiner).

Salmenkaita also fails to cure the above shortcomings of Evensen because, as discussed above, Salmenkaita fails to disclose or even hint at any location request, nor does any privacy check or the so-called codeword match of Evensen as Examiner mentioned on a location request based on his updated privacy profile at all. In addition, in the sections cited by Examiner in the office action, Salmenkaita at best discloses among other things that, when carrying out the determination of the current context of his wireless device 100, his wireless device 100 sends updated privacy profile to his network server 140, and then his network server 140 updates his CACHED PRIVACY PROFILE 144.   But Salmenkaita fails to disclose or even hint that his network server 140 or any other network element performs a privacy check on a deferred location request or the like based on the updated privacy profile as resides in claim 12 (col. 35, lines 24-60).   Furthermore, as stated in the office action, in Salmenkaita, for the purpose of protecting end users privacy, it is based on current context-activity of his wireless device, which is very different from what is disclosed in claim 12.

In addition, as for combination or the teaching of the combination of Evensen and Salmenkaita, as discussed before, in Evensen, for providing enhanced user privacy user, only a location request that includes approved codewords from a list of approved codewords is accepted. In other words, a codeword included in Evensen's location request must match a codeword from this approved codeword list for the location request to be request (see, abstract, paragraphs 16 and 17).   That is, Evensen is mainly directed for the provision of enhanced user privacy and for this purpose of enhanced user privacy, Evensen is based on the matching of the codeword included in a location request with a codeword of approved codeword list.   In contrast, as stated in the office action, Salmenkaita is mainly directed for protecting end users privacy and is based

on the current context-activity for his purpose of the protection of end users privacy, which is very different and teaches away from the teaching of Evensen.

Therefore, at least for any one reason discussed above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the references of record do not disclose all limitations or render obvious of claim 12. Thus, claim 12 is believed to be allowable over the references of record.

Claims 3-11 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 12 and add further elements or additional limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the references of record at least in view of their dependence on an allowable claim.

New Claims

New claims 13-24 are added herein and do not contain new matter. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims are patentable as well over the cited references because the references of record fail to disclose all the limitations of these claims. In these new claims, claims 13-15 depend from allowable independent claim 12 and thus are allowable over the references of record. Claims 16 and 21 are independent claims and recites similar recitations to those discussed above of claim 12 and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 17-20 and claim 22-24 depend from independent claims 16 and 22 respectively and thus allowable over the references of record.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed or rendered moot. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ira S. Matsil, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be

resolved as expeditiously as possible. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any

fees that are due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

July 1, 2010   /Ira S. Matsil/
Date   Ira S. Matsil
                                     Attorney for Applicant
                                     Reg. No. 35,272

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas   75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218